REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 28, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 were pending; rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Le et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,082,598); and rejected claims 1-7 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,008) and Le et al. Claim 8 is cancelled. Thus, claims 1-7 and 9-13 are currently pending. The rejections are traversed below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 9 is amended herein to address an antecedent basis issue. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Le et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,082,598).

Claim 8 is cancelled herein.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,008) and Le et al.

Claim 1 recites "an input section receiving a system switchover command from a user to cause the USB host to selectively recognize the system as a USB mass storage or a data sync client" (lines 5 and 6). The Office Action states on page 4 that Sparks et al. does not disclose these features, instead relying on Le et al. The Applicant respectfully submits that Le et al. also fails to teach these features.

Le et al. discusses a system and method that "dynamically changes the current driver for the device while the computer system is continuously powered on and the OS is continuously operational" (see column 4, lines 61-67). If a user "wants the PDA to synchronize or otherwise communicate with some other application than the 'standard' synchronization application", "the user, or a supervisory application or module, loads the agent onto the main computer's OS" (see column 30, lines 63-67, of Le et al.). "In FIG. 18, the agent is shown as including a driver

decision 'switch' 1854 to indicate the agent's function of choosing which driver---Source or Target---to cause the OS to load and control the device 1810" (column 32, lines 41-44, of Le et al.). "The agent 1850 is loaded as a software module within the OS 1830" (column 32, lines 25 and 26, of Le et al.).

The Office Action states that "Le further discloses a user selectively loading a different driver than the driver currently loaded and communicating with the USB host using the loaded driver" and that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the PDA of Sparks with the driver switching ability of Le ... in order to allow the device to act like a different device for a limited time to expose unique features (See Column 2 Lines 24-27 and Column 31 Lines 48-55 of Le)" (page 5). As such, it appears the Examiner believes it is possible to obtain the features of claim 1 by combining the PDA briefly mentioned in column 3, line 39 of Sparks et al. as a device in the system for controlling access to a device in a computer system described in Le et al.

However, Le et al. does not teach using "an input section" of a "personal hand held terminal system" for "receiving a system switchover command from a user to cause the USB host to selectively recognize the system as a USB mass storage or a data sync client", as claimed. Rather, per the above, Le et al. expressly states that the "agent" includes a driver decision switch and that the agent is loaded as a software module of the OS. It is the **agent in the OS of the computer system** that decides which drivers are used to control devices in said computer system (see column 4, lines 61-67). In other words, Le et al. seems to indicate that the agent controls driver selection for devices, not that devices control driver selection. As such, the cited art teaches neither receiving a system switchover command from a user of a personal hand held terminal system, nor that it is the personal hand held terminal system controlling the selection.

Claim 1 also recites "an input section receiving a system switchover command from a user to cause the USB host to selectively recognize the system as a USB mass storage or a data sync client" and "a control section selectively loading the data sync driver or the USB mass storage driver into the personal hand held terminal system according to the system switchover command" (lines 5-8). The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to teach these features.

The Office Action states that "Le further discloses a user selectively loading a different driver than the driver currently loaded" (page 5). Page 5 of the Office Action generally refers to broad portions of Le et al. in the rejection (column 8, line 29 through column 9, line 32, column

30, lines 65-67, column 31, line 35 through column 32, line 3 and column 32, lines 41-48). The Applicant is uncertain which section(s) thereof the Examiner believes to teach the above features, but the cited sections do not teach that the user provides a "system switchover command", as claimed.

Le et al. discusses a "manual-acquire mode" in the context of "accepting ACQUIRE requests to substitute the driver for already connected devices" (see column 8, lines 15-28). "The process of driver substitution in this case involves simulating (in software) disconnection of the device, then simulating reconnection of the device" (column 8, lines 32-35, of Le et al.). While "the user" may load "the agent into the main computer's OS" (see column 30, lines 65-67), nothing is cited or found indicating that the user provides a system switchover command, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Le et al. appears to discuss simulated device disconnection and reconnection. Further, Le et al. discusses failing to achieve "the desired driver switch in a way that is transparent to the user" as a "problem" (see column 3, lines 2-6). Thus, it appears that Le et al. aims to achieve transparent driver substitution without user selection, not via a user-provided system switchover command, as claimed.

The Applicant also respectfully submits that the combination of Le et al. and Sparks et al. is improper. Sparks et al. discusses a "screen saving application program with wireless and protecting message capability" (column 1, lines 6-9). Sparks et al. discusses briefly that "an electronic information processing device 200 or computer" may encompass "a personal digital assistant" (see column 3, lines 33, 34 and 39). On the other hand, Le et al. discusses a system and method that "dynamically changes the current driver for the device while the computer system is continuously powered on and the OS is continuously operational" (see column 4, lines 61-67). As such, Sparks et al. appears to be directed to computer screen saving software with a wireless messaging capability while Le et al. is directed to a system for dynamically changing a device driver. The Applicant does not believe that these references are analogous art.

Further, the Applicant does not believe that the mere mention of a personal digital assistant in Sparks et al. would be sufficient to teach a person of ordinary skill in the art how to modify Le et al. to arrive at the features recited in claim 1. As discussed above, Le et al. seems to indicate that the agent controls driver selection for devices, not that devices control driver selection. There does not appear to be any teaching as to why a device would control its own driver selection in the system of Le et al. Thus, Le et al. and Sparks et al., both individually and in combination, fail to render claim 1 obvious.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and add further features thereto. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to these claims.

Claim 4 is amended herein to recite "loading a preset USB mass storage driver into the personal hand held terminal system, if a system/USB mass storage switchover command is input by a user to cause the USB host to selectively recognize the system as a USB mass storage client" (lines 3-5). As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited art teaches neither receiving a system switchover command from a user of a personal hand held terminal system, nor that it is the personal hand held terminal system controlling the selection. Thus, claim 4 also patentably distinguishes over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4 and add further features thereto. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to these claims.

Claim 7 recites "an input section" of a personal hand held terminal system "receiving a data transmission/reception specification request from a user" (lines 4 and 5). Claims 8 and 13 recite similar features. The cited art fails to teach receiving a system switchover command from a user of a personal hand held terminal system. Thus, claims 7, 8 and 13 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Claims 9, 10 and 12 depend from claim 8 and add further features thereto.

Claim 11 recites "an input section" of a personal digital assistant "receiving a data sync transmission/reception request from a user" (line 3). The cited art fails to teach this feature. Thus, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

For at least the reason above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1-28-2008

By: _____
Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501